1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 7 8 TRACY WEBB. Case No. 3:17-cv-00300-MMD-WGC 9 Plaintiff, ORDER ACCEPTING AND ADOPTING 10 REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ٧. OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE 11 ATLANTIS SECURITY AND WILLIAM G. COBB MANAGEMENT, et al., 12 13 Defendants. 14 Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate 15 Judge William G. Cobb (ECF No. 5) ("R&R") relating to plaintiff's application to proceed 16 in forma pauperis (ECF No. 1) and civil rights complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 17 (ECF No. 1-1). Plaintiff had until August 16, 2017, to file an objection. To date, no 18 19 objection to the R&R has been filed¹. This Court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or 20 recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party 21 timely objects to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, then the court is 22 required to "make a de novo determination of those portions of the [report and 23 recommendation] to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party 24 fails to object, however, the court is not required to conduct "any review at all . . . of any 25 issue that is not the subject of an objection." Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). 26 27

¹ Plaintiff has apparently failed to file a notice of change to her address pursuant to LR IA 3-1 because orders from this Court have been returned as undeliverable. (ECF Nos. 4, 6.)

28

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19		
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	1	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	2	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	3	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	4	
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	5	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	6	
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	7	7
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	8	3
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ç)
12 13 14 15 16 17	10)
13 14 15 16 17	11	
14 15 16 17	12	2
15 16 17 18	13	3
16 17 18	14	ļ
17 18	15	5
18	16	3
	17	7
19	18	3
	19)

Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. See United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to which no objections were mad2e); see also Schmidt v. Johnstone, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) (reading the Ninth Circuit's decision in Reyna-Tapia as adopting the view that district courts are not required to review "any issue that is not the subject of an objection."). Thus, if there is no objection to a magistrate judge's recommendation, then the court may accept the recommendation without review. See, e.g., Johnstone, 263 F. Supp. 2d at 1226 (accepting, without review, a magistrate judge's recommendation to which no objection was filed).

Nevertheless, this Court finds it appropriate to engage in a *de novo* review to determine whether to adopt Magistrate Judge Cobb's R&R. Upon reviewing the R&R and proposed complaint, this Court finds good cause to accept and adopt the Magistrate Judge's R&R in full.

It is therefore ordered, adjudged and decreed that the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (ECF No. 5) is accepted and adopted in its entirety.

It is ordered that plaintiff's application to proceed *in form pauperis* (ECF No. 1) is denied without prejudice.

It is further ordered that the complaint be dismissed with prejudice.

The Clerk is directed to enter judgment in accordance with this Order and closed this case.

DATED THIS 31st day of August 2017.

25

20

21

22

23

24

26

27

28

MIRANDA M. DU UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE